



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,001	07/09/2003	Daryl E. Anderson.	200209524-1	3107

22879 7590 07/13/2007  
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

DAILEY, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/617,001	Applicant(s) ANDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Thomas J. Dailey	Art Unit 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 17-24, 26, 27 and 29-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-38 are pending in this application.
2. Claims 13-16, 25, 28, and 38 were canceled by the amendment filed on April 26, 2007.
3. Claims 1-12, 17-24, 26-27, and 29-37 are being considered for evaluation in this office action.

### *Response to Arguments*

4. The applicant argued with respect to claim 3's 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection that the meaning of the term "approximately" is well known to persons having ordinary skill in the art as well as lay persons.
5. The examiner disagrees. The applicant is reminded, as provided in MPEP 2173.05(b):

When a term of degree is presented in a claim, first a determination is to be made as to whether the specification provides some standard for measuring that degree. If it does not, a determination is made as to whether one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the prior art and the status of the art, would be nevertheless reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. *Even if the specification uses the same term of degree as in the claim, a rejection may be proper if the scope of the term is not understood when read in light of the specification.*

The term "approximately", given in the context of claim 3, "transmitting portions of the graphical data to such that **no more than approximately 2 kilobits** of graphical data is transmitted per second" (claim 3 lines 2-3, emphasis added) and contrasted with its usage in the specification, "Accordingly, with

Art Unit: 2152

reference to block 308, the graphical data is transmitted at a controlled rate (under the control of the transmission control manager 214) that **does not exceed a predetermined maximum data transfer rate**. By way of example, the **maximum data transfer rate is set to approximately 2 kilobits per second,**" (page 8, lines 19-23, emphasis added) renders the claim indefinite. The specification clearly states that the controlled rate does not exceed a maximum data transfer rate, and gives that maximum transfer rate an approximate value. However, the claim reads as transmitting no more than approximately 2 kilobits; transmitting at approximately 2 kilobits may very well exceed 2 kilobits and therefore no "predetermined maximum data transfer rate" not to be exceeded exists.

6. The applicant argues with respect to claims 1, 6, 24, 26, and 27 that Laube (US Pat. 4,653,086) does not teach "transmitting portions" of graphical data "at a controlled rate that does not exceed a predetermined maximum data transfer rate at which a bandwidth of the communication line would be exceeded."
7. The examiner disagrees. As the applicant points out, Laube discloses transmitting graphical information and voice data via a frequency multiplexer (column 5, lines 45-52). Transmission using frequency division multiplexing inherently is done at a controlled rate with a predetermined maximum data transfer rate, i.e. the bandwidths of the frequency divisions. Naturally it follows

that if both graphical information and voice data are transmitted using frequency division multiplexing, the transmission of the graphical data alone can not exceed that same "predetermined maximum data transfer rate at which a bandwidth of the communication line would be exceeded" associated with frequency division multiplexing.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claim amended claim 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
9. The applicant amended claim 29 to include an "*independent sketchpad device*" and "an input device that is configured to receive voice data *from a separate telephone.*" The applicant argues Laube teaches neither an independent sketchpad device nor that it receives voice data from a separate telephone.
10. The examiner disagrees; Laube teaches an independent sketchpad device (Fig 1) that receives voice data from a separate telephone (the device will receive voice data from a separate phone that it is in communication with, i.e. the other end of a two way conversation).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2152

12. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

13. The term "approximately " in claim 3 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. See the above response to arguments for further information with regards this claim. The term "approximately" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The claim will be interpreted as keeping bandwidth consumption below a certain point.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

15. Claims 1-12, 21-24, 26-27, and 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Laube (US Pat. No. 4,653,086).

16. As to claim 1, Laube discloses a method for transmitting graphical data via a communication line (Abstract), comprising:

generating graphical data representative of a user input (column 6, lines 64-66);

buffering the graphical data in memory (column 6, line 66-column 7, line 1);  
and

transmitting portions of the graphical data over the communication line to a remote device (column 7, lines 1-10 and column 5, lines 45-47) at a controlled rate that does not exceed a predetermined maximum data transfer rate at which a bandwidth of the communication line would be exceeded (column 5, lines 47-52, transmission using frequency division multiplexing inherently is done at a controlled rate with a predetermined maximum data transfer rate, i.e. the bandwidths of the frequency divisions).

17. As to claim 6, Laube a method for transmitting graphical data via a communication line, comprising:

generating graphical data representative of a user input (column 6, lines 64-66);

identifying discrete data points of the generated graphical data (column 6, line 66-column 7, line 1, extracted coordinate values read on "discrete data points");  
and

transmitting only the identified discrete data points over the communication line to a remote device (column 7, lines 1-10 and column 5, lines 45-47) such less than all of the generated graphical data is transmitted so as to not exceed a bandwidth of the communication line (column 5, lines 47-52, transmission using frequency division multiplexing inherently is done at a controlled rate with a predetermined maximum data transfer rate, i.e. the bandwidths of the frequency divisions).

18. As to claim 24, Laube a system for sharing graphical data via a communication line (Abstract), comprising:

means for receiving voice data (column 1, lines 60-63);

means for generating graphical data representative of a user input entered into a touch-sensitive display (column 6, lines 64-66); and

means for simultaneously transmitting the voice data and information representative of the generated graphical data via the communication line such that a bandwidth of the communication line is not exceeded (column 5, lines 45-53, transmission using frequency division multiplexing inherently is done at a controlled rate with a predetermined maximum data transfer rate, i.e. the bandwidths of the frequency divisions), wherein the means for transmitting comprise means for buffering the graphical data and means for transmitting portions of the graphical data over the communication line at a controlled rate



Art Unit: 2152

that does not excess a predetermined maximum data transfer rate (column 5, lines 45-53).

19. As to claim 26, it is rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim 24's rejection.

20. As to claim 27, it is rejected by the same rationale set forth in claims 6 and 24's rejections.

21. As to claim 29, Laube discloses a independent sketchpad device (Fig. 1), comprising:

- a processing device (Fig. 2, label 76);

- an input device that is configured to receive voice data from a separate telephone (Fig. 2, label 90 and column 5, lines 45-53, the device will receive voice data from a separate phone that it is in communication with, i.e. the other end of a two way conversation);

- a user interface with which a user can input information (Fig. 2, label 30);

- an output device that is configured to transmit data (Fig. 2, label 90 and column 5, lines 45-53); and

- memory that includes a sketch program that identifies user input entered via the user interface and that generates graphical data representative of the user input (column 6, line 66-column 7, line 1), and a

transmission control manager that is configured to, via the output device, simultaneously transmit the voice data and information representative of the generated graphical data via a communication line such that a bandwidth of the communication line is not exceeded (column 5, lines 34-53).

22. As to claims 2 and 7, Laube discloses generating graphical data comprises generating graphical data representative of a line entered using a touch-sensitive display (Fig. 4, and column 6, line 64-column 7, line 1).

23. As to claim 3, Laube discloses transmitting portions of the graphical data to such that no more than approximately 2 kilobits of graphical data is transmitted per second (column 5, lines 45-52).

24. As to claim 4, Laube discloses receiving voice data input via a telephone (Fig. 1 and column 1, lines 60-63).

25. As to claims 5, 12, and 31, Laube discloses simultaneously transmitting the voice data over the communication line along with the portions of graphical data (column 5, lines 45-53).

26. As to claim 8, Laube discloses identifying data points on a periodic basis in which a data point is identified for every predetermined period during user input (column 6, line 64-column 7, line 1).

27. As to claim 9, Laube discloses identifying discrete data points comprises identifying data points on a line length basis in which a data point is identified for every predetermined length of user input (column 5, lines 1-7, distance between "the coordinates" is the predetermined length).

28. As to claims 10 and 35, Laube discloses buffering the generated graphical data and identifying new discrete data points that are positioned between the previously identified data points and transmitting the new data points over the communication line (column 6, line 64-column 7, line 5, "redundancy reduction" will only send newly identified points).

29. As to claim 11, Laube discloses repeating the steps of claim 10 in an iterative process (column 6, line 64-column 7, line 5, the process is clearly continuous until the phone is hung up, column 7, lines 30-33).

30. As to claim 21 and 33, Laube discloses providing an indication can to the user entering the input that communicates what portion of the input has been

Art Unit: 2152

transmitted or is currently visible to a recipient (column 6, lines 64-66, what is displayed for the user displayed for the recipient).

31. As to claim 22, Laube discloses providing an indication comprises showing a portion of the input in at least one of a different color (Fig. 4, and column 6, line 64-column 7, line 1), a different grayscale, and a different line thickness.

32. As to claim 23, Laube discloses comprising removing the indication after passage of a period of time (column 7, lines 30-33, when the phone is hung up, the writing is erased).

33. As to claim 30, Laube discloses the input device comprises a telephone jack (Abstract, lines 1-5).

34. As to claim 32, Laube discloses the output device comprises a modem (column 5, lines 45-52).

35. As to claim 34, it is rejected by the same rationale set forth in claim 1's rejection.

36. As to claim 36, Laube discloses identifying a new reference data point (column 5, lines 1-7), transmitting information that describes the new reference data point via the communication line (column 5, lines 7-10), identifying coordinates of

another data point that identify the location of the other data point relative to the new reference data point (column 5, lines 1-7, occurs again when the pen is moved), and transmitting the coordinates via the communication line (column 5, lines 7-10).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

37. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

38. Claims 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laube in view of Lamb (US Pat. No. 6,791,571).

39. As to claim 17, Laube discloses a method for transmitting graphical data via a communication line (Abstract), comprising:

generating graphical data representative of a user input (column 6, lines 64-66);

identifying a reference data point (column 6, line 66-column 7, line 1, any extracted coordinate value reads on "a reference point");

transmitting information that describes the reference data point via the communication line (column 7, lines 1-10 and column 5, lines 45-47);

Art Unit: 2152

identifying coordinates of a further data point that identify the location of the further data point relative to the reference data point (column 6, line 66-column 7, line 1); and

transmitting the coordinates to another device via the communication line (column 7, lines 1-10 and column 5, lines 45-47).

Laube, however, does not disclose that the coordinates are relative, rather Laube identifies and transmits coordinates and does not go into specifics as to how they are defined.

Lamb, however, discloses using a relative coordinate system for processing and displaying graphical information (Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Laube and Lamb in order to provide Laube with a specific, known coordinate system to use in his system that will reliably handle graphical data, rather than the generic implementation with no specifics that was disclosed.

40. As to claim 18, Laube and Lamb discloses the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 17, and further disclose generating graphical data comprises

generating graphical data representative of a line entered using a touch-sensitive display (Laube, Fig. 4, and column 6, line 64-column 7, line 1).

41. As to claim 19, Laube and Lamb discloses the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 17, and further disclose identifying a new reference data point (Laube, column 5, lines 1-7), transmitting information that describes the new reference data point via the communication line (Laube, column 5, lines 7-10), identifying coordinates of another data point that identify the location of the other data point relative to the new reference data point (Laube, column 5, lines 1-7, occurs again when the pen is moved), and transmitting the coordinates via the communication line (Laube, column 5, lines 7-10).

Laube, however, does not disclose that the coordinates are relative, rather Laube identifies and transmits coordinates and does not go into specifics as to how they are defined.

Lamb, however, discloses using a relative coordinate system for processing and displaying graphical information (Abstract).

42. As to claim 20, Laube and Lamb discloses the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 17, and further disclose simultaneously transmitting the voice

data over the communication line along with the portions of graphical data  
(Laube, column 5, lines 45-53).

43. As to claim 21, Laube and Lamb discloses the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 17, and further disclose providing an indication can to the user entering the input that communicates what portion of the input has been transmitted or is currently visible to a recipient (Laube, column 6, lines 64-66, what is displayed for the user displayed for the recipient).

44. As to claim 22, Laube and Lamb discloses the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 21, and further disclose providing an indication comprises showing a portion of the input in at least one of a different color (Laube, Fig. 4, and column 6, line 64-column 7, line 1), a different grayscale, and a different line thickness.

45. As to claim 23, Laube and Lamb discloses the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 22, and further disclose removing the indication after passage of a period of time (Laube, column 7, lines 30-33, when the phone is hung up, the writing is erased).



46. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laube as applied to claims 24 and 29, in view of Kishimoto et al (US Pat. No. 4,597,101), hereafter "Kishimoto."

47. As to claim 37, Laube discloses the invention substantially with regard to the parent claim 29, and further discloses receiving via the communication line discrete data points that represent graphical data (column 6, line 64-column 7, line 1).

Laube does not disclose means for generating line segments that connect the discrete data points, and means for displaying the line segments such that a resultant line is shown that comprises the line segments and that represents a user input entered into another device.

However, Kishimoto discloses receiving via the communication line discrete data points that represent graphical data (column 10, lines 8-23), means for generating line segments that connect the discrete data points (Fig. 4, and column 7, lines 55-68, and "difference vectors" (column 2, lines 15-25) read on "line segments"), and means for displaying the line segments such that a resultant line is shown that comprises the line segments and that represents a user input entered into another device (Fig. 4 and column 3, lines 59-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Laube and Kishimoto in order to more efficiently encode the graphical data thereby decreasing bandwidth requirements (Kishimoto, column 2, lines 3-14).

### ***Conclusion***

48. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
49. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.
50. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Dailey whose telephone number is


Art Unit: 2152

571-270-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday;  
9:00am - 5:00pm.

51. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

52. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
TJD  
6/27/2007

  
BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
7/5/07